DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 033 089 08 SP 003 217

By-Haines, Peter G.; Rowe, Kenneth L.

A Seminar for Distributive Education Program Development Through Teacher Education. Final Report.

Michigan State Univ., East Lansing. Dept. of Secondary Education.
Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
Bureau No-BR-7-0489
Pub Date 68
Grant-OEG-3-7-070489-3128
Note-42p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.20
Descriptors-*Distributive Education, Project Training Methods, *Teacher Educator Education, *Teacher Seminars

A 1-week national seminar was conducted in May 1967 (one section at Michigan State, one at Arizona State) for 52 educators and researchers responsible for designing and administering training programs for teachers in the field of marketing and distribution. The major objective was to broaden participant understanding of the project method of instruction (a method which does not rely on the cooperative laboratory as an instruction vehicle) and its demands concerning preservice and inservice teacher education programs. Guest lecturers presented papers on several themes: Perspectives in Program Development in Distributive Education; Nature and Theory of the Project Method; Managing and Controlling Learning Experiences in the Classroom; Teacher Behavior in the Project Classroom; and Gearing Up Teacher Education Programs for Project Instruction. Small Task force groups of participants discussed the concepts and produced reports on implications for two areas of need: school and classroom, and teacher education. The papers and task force reports are contained in three seminar publications: one is a series of readings on the project plan in distributive education; the others are guidelines for implementing the plan in schools and through teacher education. (Included are discussion of a series of impacts the seminar has had on the profession--as evaluated 15 months later--and recommendations of the directors regarding continued efforts.) (JS)

ED033089

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

FINAL REPORT

Project No. 7-0489
Grant No. OEG-3-7-070489-3128

A SEMINAR FOR DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT THROUGH TEACHER EDUCATION

By

Peter G. Haines

and

Kenneth L. Rowe

DEPARTMENT OF SECONDARY EDUCATION AND CURRICULUM
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

EAST LANSING, MICHIGAN
1968

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

SP003217

FOREWORD

There is no question that this seminar will be seen historically as a milestone in improving teacher education and the program of project instruction in the schools. But without the assistance of the excellent staff an intensive and comprehensive seminar of this type could not have been a success.

Our three colleagues from other universities who were employed as staff members -- Professors Buckner, Meyer, and Samson -- were of great assistance and gave freely of their time at two planning sessions, by mail and telephone, and during the seminar. They brought to the seminar their depth of experience in distributive teacher education and their ability to empathize with their colleagues.

The two associate directors were the actual organizers and directors of their sections. Professors Ferguson and Rowe devoted hundreds of hours to preparation and planning and chaired the major sessions. Their efforts were matched in dedication by the two graduate assistants, for without Bill Woolf and Don Pettit many details might have gone unattended.

My personal thanks go also to the U.S.O.E. program specialists, Edwin Nelson and Mary Marks for their hours of energy and their insights so helpful to the original planning. It was most unfortunate that federal travel restrictions prevented them from attending the seminar to give of their national leadership and profit from interaction with their colleagues.

The seminar director is most appreciative of the close and cordial cooperation offered by the administration of Arizona State University, especially the chairman of the Department of Business Education, Dr. Don Tate, and the Director of Management Conferences, Edward Scannell.

The professional concern shown by our administrative assistant, Karl Stearns, and our secretary, Mrs. Hatte Hazlett are to be commended. The office staff worked under great time pressure but did a wonderfully accurate job of producing more than 500 pages of papers and task force reports within a period of two weeks.

Thanks should go also to: the Gregg Division of McGraw-Hill Book Co., South-Western Publishing Co., and the Michigan Retailers Association for their courtesies to the participants.

Peter G. Haines
East Lansing, Michigan

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

I. Summary 1

II. Introduction 5

III. The Method -- Seminar Organization 8

IV. The Seminar Program. 11

V. Findings 14

VI. Conclusions -- An Evaluation of Seminar Outcomes 17

Appendices:

A. Roster of Participants 26

B. Seminar Staff and Roster of Lecturers and Task Force Leaders 29

C. Guidelines for Task Forces and Participants. 31

D. Production Schedule for Video Taping 33

E. Publications of the Seminar. 36

F. Application for National Seminar in Distributive Education 37

I. SUMMARY

The Vocational Education Act of 1968 posed a great challenge to distributive educators to develop a method of instruction which did not rely upon the cooperative laboratory as an instructional vehicle. The law authorized instruction for those preparing to enter employment and position papers subsequently developed the theory of what came to be called the project plan of preparatory instruction. It became apparent that if this type of program was to become a part of the on-going instruction in schools, that teacher education would be a leading vehicle in the adoption process. Both pre-service and in-service teacher education activities would be involved in training additional instructional personnel.

This national seminar was programmed to begin the developmental process. Under a consortium of two universities, the seminar was operated in two sections: Eastern at Michigan State University during May 7-12, 1967 and Western at Arizona State University during May 21-26, 1967. The seminar involved 52 participants, the majority of whom were teacher educators. The remainder were supervisory personnel or researchers who had on-going responsiblity for developing teacher education activities.

The purposes of the seminar were:

> *To assist teacher education staffs to identify, evaluate, and respond to the implications of recent legislation and changes in education and distribution for pre-service and in-service teacher education programs.*

Within the context of this purpose for the seminar were the following immediate objectives:

1. To build among teacher educators and associated state staff a deeper knowledge of the theory and nature of the project method of instruction.
2. To create understanding of the project method of instruction as it operates in the classroom and to draw from this understanding awareness of the competencies needed by the classroom teacher.
3. To derive implications for distributive teacher education practices from an understanding of recent innovations and research in teacher education.
4. To improve the content and design of teacher education programs related to project method teachers.

5. To determine needed adjustments in the organization, administration, and resource allocation of teacher education programs.
6. To assist institutions with plans for summer institutes for project method teachers by developing greater awareness of teacher competency needs.

The content of the seminar was presented through major papers presented by guest lecturers and staff consultants and were centered upon several themes:

1. Perspectives in Program Development in D.E. -- Past, Present, and Future
2. The Nature and Theory of the Project Method -- Projects and Their Structure, Outcomes of Projects
3. Managing and Controlling Learning Experiences in the Classroom
4. Teacher Behavior in the Project Classroom
5. Gearing Up Teacher Education Programs for Project Instruction

Through these papers and subsequent discussions, the pertinent problems and issues were identified, various points of view considered, and tentative solutions proposed.

Almost half the week was devoted to task forces composed of the participants. These groups were organized for the purposes of:

1. Providing a vehicle for small group discussion of the concepts presented through speeches, demonstrations, and papers;
2. Providing each seminar participant the opportunity to "think through" problems, to see implications for him in his teacher education work, and to allow him to bring his experiences to bear on problems;
3. Developing the content for documents to be produced and disseminated to the profession as a seminar output.

The task forces developed reports around two areas of need:

1. School and Classroom Series:
   - S - 1 Implementing the Project Plan with Administrators, Counselors, and Businessmen
   - S - 2 Managing and Controlling the Project Classroom
   - S - 3 Facilities, Equipment, Materials, and Media
   - S - 4 The Youth Organization as a Teaching-Learning Device
   - S - 5 Evaluation of Project Outcomes
   - S - 6 Guidance, Student Selection, and Identification
2. Teacher Education Series:
   - TE - 1 Competencies and Experiences Needed by Project Plan Teachers
   - TE - 2 In-Service Teacher Education

TE - 3 Experiences Needed by the Teacher-Trainee

TE - 4 Ancillary Services, Research, and Materials Development

TE - 5 Resources Needed by the Teacher Education Institution

The major findings of the seminar were composed of the papers presented and the implications as identified in the task force reports. These findings are contained in three publications which are available through ERIC. The titles are:

1. Readings in Distributive Education -- The Project Plan of Instruction and Related Teacher Education
2. Guidelines for Implementing the Project Plan of Instruction in Distributive Education in the Schools
3. Guidelines for Implementing the Project Plan of Instruction in Distributive Education Through Teacher Education

In addition to the publications which resulted, the outcomes of the seminar were a series of impacts upon the profession. As evaluated 15 months after the seminar:

1. The participants felt that the seminar had stimulated their thinking and resulted in a greater understanding of the nature and process of the project plan of instruction.
2. The participants had taught more than 680 persons in courses or credit workshops dealing exclusively or primarily with the project method. They had reached more than 2400 students in courses in which the project method was given some emphasis.
3. Participants had made presentations regarding the project plan of instruction to more than 80 professional audiences totalling approximately 3600 people.
4. The major publications of the seminar were being used in teacher education classes as required texts and more extensively as reference readings.
5. Participants had prepared 14 books, papers, or articles published or accepted dealing with the project method.
6. Seven research or curriculum studies were reported underway dealing with the project method of instruction.

The directors of the seminar believe that after a period of 18 months that the evaluation supports the following major recommendations:

1. That a series of regional conferences be sponsored by the U.S.O.E. to communicate to state staff and local leadership the essential nature of the project method and the experiences of schools who have innovated with this plan.
2. That every effort be made by the U.S.O.E. and the various states to provide priority resources to experimental programs in schools, to the development of appropriate instructional materials, and to workshops to train a large number of project method teachers.

3. That additional teacher education seminars be undertaken with a view to the professional growth of the many new teacher education personnel and to provide dialogue and professional attention to many other teacher education problems.

4. That the Council for Distributive Teacher Education (an AVA affiliate) take steps to develop a plan for a series of teacher education seminars and that an action committee develop a comprehensive action program to implement such a plan.

5. There is need for many workshops usually statewide, or in some cases for individual metropolitan areas, to train many teachers in the project method of instruction. A central pattern for the workshops might well be developed by a national committee.

6. There is an imperative need for curriculum development projects wherein a pilot school network can be used to test out project instructional methods, media, and materials including operational simulations. Such networks should use the schools as a clinical basis for development and evaluation.

7. A follow-up study should be made by 1970 to identify the types of teacher education experiences which are being used to develop competence in project method.

8. It is essential that an intensive effort be underwritten which would focus the efforts of teacher educator scholars on the theory and practice of the project method. This effort might be built around such topics as the nature and theory of simulations in learnings, the structure of projects, and the relationship of project learnings to a matrix of competencies needed in distributive occupations.

II. INTRODUCTION

One of the most dramatic changes in the development of programming for education in the field of marketing and distribution was brought about as a result of the Vocational Education Act of 1963. It was, therefore, essential that changes be made in education for marketing and distribution in both pre-service and in-service teacher education programs. This seminar provided an opportunity for distributive teacher educators and associated state staff personnel to widen their knowledge, update their thinking and relate to demands of a dynamic teacher education program.

The overall reason for the 1967 teacher education seminar was to bring together teacher educators, state supervisors, and others who must design and administer distributive teacher education programs, and provide an opportunity for them to broaden their understanding of the project method of instruction and its demands concerning: (a) the future preparation of teachers, (b) the implications of research on distributive teacher education practices, and (c) improvement of content, design and administration of teacher education programs.

The seminar was held in two 30-participant sections, one at Michigan State University during the week of May 7-12, 1967, and one at Arizona State University from May 21-26, 1967.

This final report is descriptive first and relates the seminar as it occurred. More importantly, the report is evaluative; it stresses the impacts of the seminar as seen 15 months after participants returned to their professional situations.

Goals and Expectations

This was a national seminar even though it had two sections. The goals and purposes were common and within the limits of the personnel -- participants and staff -- and facilities, the two sections operated in a similar fashion. Following is the charge by the Seminar Director as it was given the participants.

> The ultimate purpose of the seminar is to foster program development in distributive education through teacher

education. There is an assumed need to build further the high school and post high school programs by the use of project training. And, this seminar will attempt to build greater understanding of the nature and operation of project training while at the same time outlining needed adjustments in the teacher education program due to project training.

If those in the seminar came away with greater understandings as professionals, one might say that the purpose of the seminar had been served. And this would be so in an academic sense because it is the teacher educator who perhaps above all must have a highly refined theoretical understanding upon which decision-making is based. But, our goal goes beyond this building of theory, for we recognize that the theory must be made operational -- the nature of project training must be communicated and disseminated to those who make it operational in schools.

Therefore, our seminar goal will not be ultimately accomplished unless the participants return and put into practice what has been learned by all of us. The ultimate goal is the development of and carrying out of a series of classes, conferences, seminars, in-service meetings, and school consultations which educate supervisors, directors, and teacher-coordinators about project training. The goal needs to be accomplished with those now in service and with those who are or will come to us in a preservice teacher situation. Our hope is, too, that you as a seminar participant will direct and participate in the development of instructional materials and professional literature which undergirds project training. Above all, the staff of the seminar see each of you as a catalyst in your state and in your region. As you look at the map of our nation and see the distribution of participants in this seminar, you can see what great potential there is for dissemination in all our states.

As you view the seminar program, you will note that there is considerable time devoted to task forces (you)! Our purposes here are two. The first is to provide you as a participant with the opportunity to interact with your colleagues and to translate theory into operational practices. The second purpose is to develop sets of literature which describe practices as they might be. Two sets are envisioned as having much future usefulness. One set will be a series of papers on project training in the classroom -- this set can be used in your training sessions with local personnel. The other set will describe teacher education practices related to project training -- hopefully this set will be guidelines for adjusting the teacher education program operated by a state or institution.

As the director of the seminar, I have also another goal in mind which is 'dear to my heart'. I believe very firmly in the role of the teacher educator as the professional leader and feel strongly that it is teacher education which shapes the long-range development of any field of professional education. Thus, I believe that this seminar will give us as teacher educators the opportunity to get together as a unified group and learn to know each other better, to react to each other's philosophy, and to come closer to a common perception of what teacher education is and can be. There have been few if any opportunities for us as teacher educators to conference by ourselves rather than be a part of a much larger conference. With so many new institutions joining our ranks and with so many new teacher educators joining us, we have a glorious opportunity at this seminar to push forward a program of teacher education which will be forward-looking and later be shown as having made a great impact in the development of Distributive Education.

III. THE METHOD -- SEMINAR ORGANIZATION

Initial Planning

The central thrust for the seminar and determination of its overall content came initially from the Distributive Education staff of the U.S. Office of Education in concert with the expressed needs of distributive education leaders. The authorization for the seminar was announced by circular letter from the U.S.O.E. which requested proposals from interested institutions.

Inquiry by the Director of the R & D program at M.S.U. to the U.S.O.E. indicated that Arizona State University had expressed interest as a sponsor. Because the teacher educator at A.S.U. had been a visiting professor at M.S.U., the notion of a partnership emerged wherein eastern and western sections of the seminar could be held and travel costs for participants reduced. It was thought also that the two sections of the county might have some educational differences in such factors as school size which might be better treated separately.

The staff at M.S.U. drafted an initial proposal after telephone discussions with the A.S.U. staff member and U.S.O.E. personnel. Following verbal approval of the proposal, the intensive planning began.

Planning for the content and organization of the seminar within the limits of this proposal was the responsibility of the director and the associate directors, assisted by an advisory council consisting of the technical consultants, the major contract staff members, and representatives of the Council for Distributive Teacher Education and the National Association of State Supervisors of Distributive Education.

The proposal was throughly discussed by the seminar director at a conference in Washington, D.C. with a program specialist from the U.S.O.E., Miss Mary Marks. Objectives were clarified to provide a more central thrust on the project method; the proposed topical outline of the seminar was revised. Suggestions were obtained regarding staffing, selections of participants, and possible output in terms of publications. It was agreed to provide additional experiences for the participants in analyzing sample

projects. This dialogue was proved later to have been indispensable; without it the seminar would not likely have met the needs as perceived by the sponsoring federal agency.

Other steps in planning included two meetings of the M.S.U./A.S.U. staff and consultant who were to be specially employed. In addition, a well-known state supervisor was brought in to review the plans as a representative of the National Association of State Supervisors of D.E. Telephone conversations were held with the U.S.O.E. specialist when special problems arose.

A major problem arose during this planning period since the contract was not issued until approximately seven weeks prior to the seminar. This meant that the sponsoring universities had to expend their funds for planning activities, including travel -- expenses which could not by federal policy be later charged to the contract. It is clear that under conditions of time pressures, such policy must be changed and allow pre-contract costs directly attributed to necessary institute planning and preparation. If the two universities had not been willing to provide additional resources, postponing the planning until receipt of the contract would have left insufficient time for a quality program.

Selection of Participants

The seminar was announced primarily through mailing of a one-page flyer although letters of invitation were sent also to designated teacher educators. In a few cases where individuals recently had taken positions and were not on standard lists, personal letters were sent. In addition, the seminar was listed in a bulletin from the U.S. Office of Education listing all funded seminars and workshops in vocational education. Approximately 450 fliers were mailed to teacher educators, state supervisors, directors of regional U.S.O.E. offices, and business teacher education institutions.

Inquiries were received from more than 110 individuals; 89 persons ultimately submitted an application. Advice regarding the ability of the individual to utilize the seminar to implement program development in his state was secured by an advisory committee of teacher educators and state supervisors as well as the program specialists for D.E. in the U.S.O.E. Preference for participation was given to the following categories:

1. Designated distributive education teacher educators who had regular faculty status; a given institution was limited to two participants.

2. State supervisors with regularly-scheduled institutional teacher education responsibilities.
3. State supervisors from states where teacher education has been established in the last two years or where teacher education is planned for introduction during the 1967-68 academic year.
4. Other state supervisors and teacher educators in non-designated institutions who have a major interest in distributive teacher education and could be expected to make a contribution to it.

The majority of the participants were teacher educators associated with universities and colleges, a few were in state supervisory positions wherein they had teacher education responsibilities, and two were research specialists. (See Appendix A for complete list.) Participants represented thirty-five states.

Staffing and Administration

The administrative staff included the R & D Program Director and his administrative assistant -- they had responsibility for overall supervision, development of the program budgets and financial matters, staffing, and production of seminar publications. Associate Directors (one from the M.S.U. section and one from A.S.U.) were responsible for direct operation for their seminar sections, including contracting with seminar speakers, local arrangements, chairing sessions, and working with consultant staff and task forces. Two graduate assistants were assigned to work with the seminar.

Physical Facilities

At Michigan State University the participants and staff were housed in the Kellogg Center for Continuing Education. All meetings* were also held there and one room was outfitted as a staff office. A large conference room was used for major sessions. Typewriters were furnished as a courtesy by the local distribution branch of a major manufacturer of electric typewriters (IBM). The conference center was an advantage since participants did not need to be transported.

At Arizona State University the meetings were held in a spacious conference room in the College of Business building. Participants were housed in a motor hotel adjacent to the campus and within walking distance of the conference site.

---

* Except for one day when a "live" video taping session was scheduled in the College of Education Building.

IV. THE SEMINAR PROGRAM

Each section of the seminar met for five full days with registration and orientation during the evening prior to the first day. About half of the week was devoted to the development of seminar themes via presentations of major papers by the staff and guest lecturers and by large group discussion and reaction. In addition shorter presentations on operational topics were given by selected participants. The other half of the seminar time was devoted to application of content through working groups which were designated as task forces.

Content Through Speakers and Presentation of Papers

The content of the seminar was organized around a number of interrelated themes with the presentation of two or three major papers related to each theme. Group discussion and questioning of guest lecturers followed the presentations. Approximately 7 hours of major speeches and panel discussions were recorded on video tape during the Michigan State Seminar and flown to Arizona State University for showing on closed-circuit television. Similarly two tapes were pre-recorded in Arizona for use at both the M.S.U. and A.S.U. sessions.

The essential role of the major presentations was that of providing the factual and conceptual framework for understanding and implementing the project method of instruction, and to prepare the way for the work of the task force groups. Pertinent problems and issues were identified, tentative solutions and points of view were considered, and substantial portions of time were devoted to the interaction and exchange of ideas among the participants, guest speakers, and the seminar staff. (Appendix C lists the major speakers.) All participants were provided with copies of the major papers as part of the Participant's Manual distributed at the evening orientation meeting on Sunday (the first day of the seminar).

The major papers presented were:

1. Project Training -- Its Impact on Program Development
2. Similarities and Differences in Project and Cooperative Training
3. Project Method in Education

4. Projects and Project Structure
5. Desired Outcomes of Projects
6. Development of a Matrix
7. Variations of Time and Place Patterns in Project Training
8. Using Appropriate Evaluation Techniques
9. Using Appropriate Materials and Media
10. The Utilization of Facilities and Equipment in Distributive Education Project Method Training
11. A Philosophy of Teacher Education: Teaching, Research, or Service?
12. Distributive Teacher Education: Its Role in Program Development
13. Gearing the Teacher Education Program for Teaching by the Project Method
14. Relations of Teacher Education to State Staff
15. Methods in Distributive Teacher Education Classrooms
16. In-Service Teacher Education
17. The Role of the Teacher Educator in Research and Materials Development
18. Teacher Behavior and Teacher Education

Task Force Activities

Task forces were set up around a series of topics which reflected the need to influence not only the preparation of teachers but also assistance to teachers in learning to control and manage the project method in the on-going classroom. In both sections of the seminar the task force organization was identical; two sets of topics were undertaken:

School and Classroom Series

S - 1 Implementing the Project Plan with Administrators, Counselors, and Businessmen

S - 2 Managing and Controlling the Project Classroom

S - 3 Facilities, Equipment, Materials, and Media

S - 4 The Youth Organization as a Teaching-Learning Device

S - 5 Evaluation of Project Outcomes

S - 6 Guidance, Student Selection, and Identification

Teacher Education Series

TE - 1 Competencies and Experiences Needed by Project Plan Teachers

TE - 2 In-Service Teacher Education

TE - 3 Experiences Needed by the Teacher-Trainee

TE - 4 Ancillary Services, Research, and Materials Development

TE - 5 Resources Needed by the Teacher Education Institution

The purposes of the task forces as stated in the charge to leaders and participants was:

> --To provide a vehicle for small group discussion of the concepts presented through speeches, demonstrations, and papers.
> --To provide each seminar participant the opportunity to 'think through' problems, to see implications for him in his teacher education work, and allow him to bring his experiences to bear on problems.
> --To develop the content for documents to be produced and disseminated to the profession as a seminar output.

Each participant was assigned to a task force by the directors after a thorough analysis of what was known of their interests, their prior professional experiences, and their professional contributions. Because distributive teacher education is a small field most of the professionals are reasonably well known to one another thus allowing the seminar staff to make such subjective judgments.

Almost half the seminar time was devoted to the task force activities including discussion of major presentations and work periods. Group leaders also scheduled their own work sessions during some evenings. Preliminary reports of the task forces were duplicated and presented on the last day of the seminar so each participant could take them home and use them in the imminent summer sessions. Leaders were asked to edit the reports within a month following the seminar. Reports from both sections of the seminar were combined into one report for the documents published as the outcomes of the seminar and described in Appendix E.

V. FINDINGS

The findings of a seminar inquiring into a new method of school instruction are difficult to report in a traditional research report format. The real findings are contained in the three professional documents published as a seminar outcome. The first of these, as shown in Appendix E, are one set of *findings* in the sense that they are professional papers inquiring into the nature of the project method. The other two documents are also *findings* in the sense that they reflect the implications, seen by seminar participants, for teacher education and public school instruction.

In addition to *findings* of the seminar as shown in documents, there were points of view experssed in seminar discussions which were the immediate concern of the participants.

Summary of Professional Thought During the Seminar

Under the challenge of change and the pressure of immediate action it is easy to lose sight of direction and sacrifice the labors of the past and present. However, at this seminar it was clear that no one proposed to discredit the best of the past in order to achieve and accept new developments; rather there was a clear sense of sound thinking, of building on the past with an awareness of need for growth and change to meet the demands of an expanding program.

During the seminar the staff detected an apparent closing toward a cohesiveness of thought regarding the project method. Also, judging by informal evaluation sessions with participants, there was a general feeling of desire to move ahead with needed program changes and with associated teacher education and research and development activities. At the same time there was detectable concern that state and local leaders who were not able to attend such a seminar might be less understanding of the nature of the project method and somewhat reluctant to encourage and support the development of the project plan of instruction within the various state programs.

Following are reported a number of what the staff believed to be significant points of view or concerns expressed by the seminar participants. Some are apparent trends of thought; others represent what were at the time

areas of disagreement upon which further work was needed.

1. While the nature and scope of the project plan and method were apparently well-defined in the papers presented and the participants were in general agreement regarding the meaning of terms, there was a signficiant element of dissatisfaction with the terms, "project plan and project method". A group suggested strongly that project instruction be labeled the "laboratory method". But, the staff consultant pointed out to the group that the cooperative plan also used a laboratory method (the on-the-job experience). It was suggested that the Council of Distributive Teacher Education set up a study committee to tackle this problem of terminology.

2. Effective utilization of the project plan in Distributive Education will require significant changes in:

   a. Curriculum patterns. The program content and objectives may remain as they are, but the methods and techniques for enriching the educational experience -- for providing opportunities for student involvement, application, and practical skill development -- must change substantially.

   b. Teacher training. Traditional distributive teacher education programs should not be expected to adequately prepare project plan teachers. Among the seminar participants there was an apparent awareness of heavy responsibility for enlightened, imaginative innovation in their teacher education programs including possibly recruitment of a different type of individual from those judged to have potential as cooperative teacher-coordinators.

   c. Relationships with the business community. There was no indication that the participants expected a slackening of utilization of resources from the marketing firms. But they did anticipate a different emphasis from that of the cooperative plan upon the methods of involvement with less reliance upon regular employment as a learning experience.

3. The project plan is viewed as possibly serving several different functions such as:

   a. A preparatory course experience to be used as a pre-requisite to enrollment under the cooperative plan. This preparatory class could provide basic concept, skill, and attitudinal development which could increase the effectiveness of learning through subsequent cooperative experiences.

   b. A plan for the terminal phase of formal career preparation. As the participants became more thoroughly acquainted with the theory and philosophy supporting the project method of instruction, they apparently became less inclined to consider it as a second-rate substitute for the cooperative plan. Although there was no concensus on this point, a segment of the group claimed to visualize the project plan, after it is properly developed and implemented, as providing more effective education and training than we have been able to achieve by any other method of instruction.

c. An instructional plan for particular kinds of situations -- particularly where business community resources for the cooperative plan are limited, or as a plan to be employed with students who are not ready for gainful employment in regular jobs.

4. There was considerable debate as to whether the project plan was to be viewed basically as a senior laboratory approach or whether it could also be used as the preparatory experience prior to entrance into the cooperative program and/or senior project laboratory.

5. There was a very considerable range of opinion as to what is a project and what is not. The range involved at one extreme the notion that any classroom activity which involved students in application activity was a project to the extreme that only individual projects could be viewed as meeting the definition. The seminar director feels strongly that part of this wide difference of opinion was narrowed during the seminar, but that part of the difference can be attributed to differences in belief about the fundamental nature of instruction in the related class as used in the cooperative plan.

6. The group agreed that if the senior project laboratory was to replace the cooperative laboratory and provide the same outcomes, that the teacher needed at least one period of coordination daily to plan projects related to student career goals. However, the group doubted the willingness of school administrators to provide this extra period for coordination.

VI. CONCLUSIONS -- AN EVALUATION OF SEMINAR OUTCOMES

The conclusions of a professional seminar are really outcomes, and this seminar was designed to produce a series of outcomes which would multiply in a series of impacts upon the profession. It was the hope of the staff that the seminar would have impacts reaching far into the future since teacher educators not only have an immediate effect upon their students and professional audiences, but fortunately have a residual impact not only through writings but through their continuing influence over many years upon teachers and those who plan to be teachers. There can be no question that the "professor-teacher educator" has a long range influence resulting from anything which enlarges this thinking and motivates him to restructure.

Within this belief in the power of teacher education was the implicit assumption by the director that the very fact of bringing together teacher educators for the first time in many years in an intimate setting would have long-range and immeasurable benefits. But any educational effort needs to be evaluated. The week-long sessions perhaps can be evaluated in and of themselves by referral to the quality of planning, of speakers, of papers, and of the plan for working task forces. Presumably these factors of the seminar operations speak for themselves to anyone who reads this report.

More importantly, the U.S.O.E. and the directors perceived that the really significant impacts of the seminar would produce the inter-personal dialogue and change in behavior which would result in long-range and sometimes immeasurable effects. In reporting such a seminar it is obviously impossible to produce a contractual final report to the sponsor which assesses such effects five or ten years later. What can be done is to assess the impacts approximately 18 months succeeding when there has been sufficient time for the participants to plan and carry out their teaching responsibilities over the period of an academic year and a summer session, when thought can be translated into printed word in professional literature, and when proposals for research and curriculum development notions can begin to be visible as on-going projects.

Thus this evaluative report is not of the seminar itself but of impacts upon the educational scene about 18 months after the seminar.

Impacts Upon the Participant

The director of the seminar had the fond hope that the week-long meeting would provide the opportunity for many teacher educators to become acquainted with one another and have the opportunity for professional dialogue. For at least a decade there has been no meeting exclusively for teacher educators in distributive education. In fact, few teacher education meetings have ever been held. The seminar director feels that this has created a serious gap in the development of distributive education.

Did the seminar create the opportunity for dialogue? One answer lies in the range of experience of the participants. Less than 40 percent of the teacher educators in D.E. attending this seminar had held such a position for more than five years. Obviously the newcomer to the field had the opportunity to meet informally with those more experienced in teacher education. A seminar such as this provides the opportunity for professionals to get together and the comments of the participants brought this out.

Outcomes from these types of interrelationships cannot be quantified nor can they be objectively measured. That they occurred can be judged from comments overheard such as "Dick and I got together at lunch today and I got some good ideas about how our program might develop" or "You know it is good to get away and charge the batteries so to speak".

A subjective evaluation of the seminar's value to the participants is perhaps best expressed by the following comments selected from among those written on the 15-month follow-up:

1. "As a result of attendance at this seminar, my personal philosophy of the relationships which exist between the project and cooperative methods was considerably sharpened. As a result I no longer feel that these instructional strategies should be classified according to an either/or proposition. But they can be profitably interwoven and used in conjunction with one another."
2. "First of all it updated me and made me aware of the tremendous potential that could be realized in selected applications of the 'project method'. The major problem appears to be meeting the resistance to change and the unwillingness of teachers to innovate, experiment, etc. The publications from the seminar will be most helpful I believe."
3. "An increased 'prestige' position for project method since the topic of a National Seminar."
4. "The 1967 National Teacher Education Seminar on the Project Method has been of more value to me in the teacher education program for D.E. personnel than any seminar that I have attended."

5. "...a positive attitude was developed from a negative one prior to the seminar."
6. "Basically it has dispelled some misgivings that the state department and some teacher-coordinators had."
7. "The seminar has been most helpful in putting the project method into perspective and how its use can benefit many more students we are not now serving."
8. "My own participation in the seminar gave me the confidence to discuss the method in my teacher education program."
9. "I feel more capable of dealing with project training in my classes. When project training comes on the scene in our state I feel my students will be receptive, supportive, and more capable of involvement in such a program."
10. "It made me a believer in the efficiency of the project method and, as such, I talk with convication about it."
11. "This conference will have important and long-lasting implications for distributive education teacher education. Most relevant conference (national) ever attended by this participant. The teacher educator should take refresher and upgrading courses and this conference was just that."
12. "Participation in the seminar provided opportunity to synthesize a great deal of information and reduce the concepts and ideas to 'usable' dimensions in teacher education."
13. "A desire to get something 'off' the ground in our state."
14. "The use of the project plan in our area vocational-technical schools (post secondary)."
15. "I was able to start D.E. programs in areas of our state-rural where only the project method can be effective."

When dealing with the top leadership of a professional field, a seminar might be well justified upon this outcome alone.

Impacts Through Teacher Education Activities

The participants prime impact was presumed to be their influence through teaching and communication through speeches and conference discussions. The major purpose of the seminar was to stimulate program development in schools through teacher education. Therefore, a survey evaluation was made 15 months after the seminar. The interval allowed sufficient time for participants to schedule calendars. The 15 month term also included a summer session as well as an academic year.

As Table 1 shows, a large number of students were affected by the teaching of seminar participants. Over 550 persons were enrolled in courses

in which the project method was the principal (major) topic studied. More than 35 sections of such courses were reported as taught by the participants. In addition, participants have taught 5 workshops, equivalent to a course, which enrolled 109 students. In addition, the participants have reached 2400 students in courses wherein the project method was a unit or topic. Such courses can be considered as significant in a long-range way since most students would be presumed to have a substantial number of years of professional contribution to D.E. ahead of them.

TABLE 1

IMPACT ON TEACHING --
COURSES, SEMINARS, & WORKSHOPS TAUGHT BY
SEMINAR PARTICIPANTS IN 15 MONTHS

Teacher Education Classes	Number of Sections	Total Enrolled (Approx.)	Average Enrollment Per Class
1. Course which has dealt *primarily* or *exclusively* with the project method	36	586	16
2. Course which as given *some but not major emphasis* to the project method	137	2,464	18
3. Workshop which was equivalent of a course -- *solely* project method	5	109	22

Source: Survey of Seminar Participants, 10/68.

Communication to Professional Publics

Because the project method is an innovation, its nature and potential contributions must be communicated to a wide array of professional audiences. Thus, a second aspect of evaluation related to the extent to which teacher

education was enhanced -- were the seminar participants communicating their knowledges through various communications techniques and to varying audiences?

As Table 2 demonstrates, the participants presented papers or made presentations to more than 85 professional education groups in the 15 months following the seminar. The total audience approximated 3600.

TABLE 2

IMPACT ON PROFESSIONAL AUDIENCES
THROUGH PAPERS AND PRESENTATIONS

Type of Conference of Group	Number	Total Approximate Audience	Average Audience
1. Across-the-board Vocational Education Group	3	113	37
2. State D.E. Conference	16	1,164	73
3. Area or Local D.E. Conference	15	603	40
4. Summer workshop or course	6	148	25
5. State Staff/Teacher Education Meeting	3	33	11
6. Short term in-service meetings	27	585	22
7. Non-D.E./V.E. groups such as school administrators and business teachers	15	988	66

Source: Survey of Seminar Participants, 10/68.

The emphasis in these presentations upon in-service meetings for D.E. personnel indicates an important, immediate impact upon those who can most directly effect immediate program development.

Dissemination of Thought Through Publications

Another communications dimension rests in professional publications -- these have the potential of a permanent and long-range impact especially in a field wherein professional text books are non-existent. Three major publications resulted from the seminar. The first was compounded from papers especially prepared by the seminar staff and selected consultants. The other two publications were derived from the task forces composed of the participants who related the theory to the actual arena of teacher education programs and local school classrooms. The contents of each publication are shown in Appendix E. Copies of all publications were sent to the ERIC Center, the U.S.O.E., state departments, and local districts. A total of 2550 copies were produced and put into professional circulation. A survey of seminar participants showed that publications were being used as shown in Table 3.

TABLE 3

USE OF PUBLICATIONS IN TEACHER EDUCATION ACTIVITIES

Number of Institutions Using:	As Required Class Text	As Suggested Reference For a Class	As Reference Suggested to An Individual Student
READINGS IN D.E.	3	28	20
GUIDELINES -- IMPLEMENTING THE PROJECT PLAN THROUGH TEACHER EDUCATION	0	17	25
GUIDELINES -- IMPLEMENTING THE PROJECT PLAN IN THE SCHOOLS	1	23	17

Source: Survey of Seminar Participants, 10/68.

A further aspect of professional communication rests in publications prepared by participants. (See Table 4.)

TABLE 4

PROFESSIONAL ARTICLES AND PAPERS PUBLISHED
RELATED TO THE PROJECT METHOD

	Number
1. Commercial textbook or manual for high school	3
2. State Project Instruction manual	2
3. Article in Professional Journal	4
4. Business Education Yearbook Chapter	1
5. Paper in Proceedings of National Professional Conference on T.E.	1
6. Article in local teacher newsletter	1
7. Reports of workshop available through ERIC	2

In addition, it can be assumed that professional teacher educators have prepared numerous materials for class use which they would not report as formal publications.

Impact Through R & D Efforts

A number of research and curriculum development projects have also been reported as coming out of the experiences of the seminar. These are examples of the "spin-off" effect of the seminar. Those reported by participants as under way or completed are:

1. A statewide curriculum development project involving 10 schools as pilot programs.
2. A media project to develop instructional materials for the introduction of the project method in a state.
3. An M.A. thesis completed and dealing with the critical requirements of projects for rural schools.
4. An M.A. study underway dealing with the development of model advertising and display projects for post high school programs.
5. A doctoral dissertation completed dealing with a comparison of the project method and the cooperative method.

6. A doctoral dissertation underway concerned with comparing achievement in two types of project classes and the cooperative program.
7. A doctoral dissertation underway investigating the nature of the project method and the techniques used by teachers.

Cost of the Seminar

It is important that leadership development programs be of high quality and produce the outcomes desired. Likewise it is important that they be efficient cost-wise. An objective cost analysis cannot be made with subjective data about output. But the efficiency can be judged by looking at the seminar impacts and the expenditures for the seminar. The U.S.O.E. contract expenditures were approximately $26,000. Thus, the cost per participant, including transportation and per diem, was approximately $500. When the notion of the production of major publications as well as impact through teacher education is considered, the conclusion can be reached that the seminar was most economical.

Some Reactions to Methods of Operation

The use of video tapes in "canning" major presentations had mixed advantages and disadvantages. The tapes did enable a speaker to be in two places at one time thereby reducing expenses of transporting speakers long distances, enabling scheduling of a major personality who could not make two trips away from his position in two weeks, and providing two groups with exactly the same presentation. However, making the tapes was time-consuming for the speaker. Further many long presentations while suitable live did not possess in the minds of Closed Circuit TV personnel the visual impact needed to sustain interest. In some cases visual aids while adequate for a small group in a conference lacked clarity when taped.

On the other hand the taping session which was viewed in a studio by one group of participants was thought to be educational in itself and productive of the use to which video taping could be put in a teacher education program. The tape prepared in a high school brought a realism to a presentation which could not have been obtained through the reading of a paper.

It was thought that the tapes could be stored and made available to the profession for use at conferences and in teacher education classrooms. Unfortunately most conference facilities and many colleges do not yet have the

closed circuit facilities conducive to easy use of tapes. Additionally the cost of translating the studio tapes into 16mm film proved to be too costly to warrant their production for the small market demand predicted.

The provision of many prepared papers was of advantage but imposed a staff burden larger than anticipated. Papers had to be edited prior to production -- a full-time staff member working two weeks was necessary. In addition, more secretarial assistance was needed for the intensive, volume production required in the days just preceding the seminar. Staff and secretarial contract costs were estimated to be at least double the contract conditions.

Recommendations

The seminar directors recommend that the following actions be taken to further extend the work already started:

1. That a series of regional conferences be sponsored by the U.S.O.E. to communicate to state staff and local leadership the essential nature of the project method and the experiences of schools who have innovated with this plan.
2. That every effort by made by the U.S.O.E. and the various states to provide priority resources to experimental programs in schools, to the development of appropriate instructional materials, and to workshops to train a large number of project method teachers.
3. That additional teacher education seminars be undertaken with a view to the professional growth of the many new teacher education personnel and to provide dialogue and professional attention to many other teacher education problems.
4. That the Council for Distributive Teacher Education (an AVA affiliate) take steps to develop a plan for a series of teacher education seminars and that an action committee develop a comprehensive action program to implement such a plan.
5. There is need for many workshops usually statewide, or in some cases for individual metropolitan areas, to train many teachers in the project method of instruction. A central pattern for the workshops might well be developed by a national committee.
6. There is an imperative need for curriculum development projects wherein a pilot school network can be used to test out project simulations. Such networks should use the schools as a clinical basis for development and evaluation.
7. A follow-up study should be made by 1970 to identify the types of teacher education experiences which are being used to develop competence in project method.
8. It is essential that an intensive effort be underwritten which would focus the efforts of teacher educator scholars on the theory and practice of the project method. This effort might be built around such topics as the nature and theory of simulations in learnings, the structure of projects, and the relationship of project learnings to a matrix of competencies needed in distributive occupations.

APPENDIX A

ROSTER OF PARTICIPANTS

Name	State/Institution	Position
Anderson, Oliver M.	State College of Iowa	Teacher Educator D.E.
Ashmun, Richard D. (Dr.)	University of Minnesota	Teacher Educator D.E.
Beima, James R.	Alaska Department of Education	Supervisor, D.E. & Office Occupations
Best, Ted	Oklahoma State Board for Vocational Education	Asst. State Supervisor of D.E.
Bikkie, James A.*	University of Nebraska	Teacher Educator D.E.
Burke, Edgar S.	Washington, D.C. Public Schools	Asst. Director, Business & Dist. Ed.
Carter, Fairchild H. (Dr.)	North Texas State Univ.	Teacher Educator D.E.
Cheshire, Harley R.	University of Georgia	Teacher Educator D.E.
Chrismer, John M. (Dr.)	Oregon State University	Teacher Educator D.E.
Coakley, Carroll B. (Dr.)	University of Tennessee	Teacher Educator D.E.
Crawford, Lucy C.	Virginia Polytechnic Inst.	Teacher Educator D.E.
Dannenberg, Raymond A. (Dr.)	Western Michigan University	Teacher Educator D.E.
Durham, William H., Jr.	East Carolina College (North Carolina)	Teacher Educator D.E.
Ertel, Kenneth A. (Dr.)	University of Idaho	Teacher Educator D.E.
Ferguson, Frank D. (Dr.)	Louisiana State University	Head, Business Ed.
Gordon, Douglas C.	Colorado State College (Greeley)	Teacher Educator D.E.
Hager, Oswald M.	University of North Dakota	Director of D.E. & State Supr. D.E.
Harris, E. Edward (Dr.)	Northern Illinois Univ.	Teacher Educator D.E.
Hartzler, Findlay	Kansas State Teachers College (Emporia)	Teacher Educator D.E.

*Participation cancelled due to illness.

APPENDIX A (Cont.)

Name	State/Institution	Position
Hecht, Joseph C. (Dr.)	Montclair State College (New Jersey)	Teacher Educator D.E.
Jefferson, Robert W.	Western Illinois University	Instructor, Bus. Admin.
Kirk, Howard W.	University of South Florida	Assistant Professor
Knouse, Reno S.	State University of New York at Albany	Teacher Educator D.E.
Levendowski, Jerry C.	California State Dept. of Education	Teacher Educator D.E.
Linn, John H. (Dr.)	San Francisco State College	Professor of Business
Little, Wayne Gerald	University of Minnesota (Crookston Tech. Inst.)	Chairman, Div. of Bus.
Lowe, Calvin D. (Dr.)	Utah State University	Teacher Educator D.E.
Luter, Robert R.	University of Texas	Assoc. Dir. of Research
Madson, John H.	State of Nevada	State Supr. D.E.
Maiden, Leonard F.	University of South Carolina	Teacher Educator D.E.
Mattingly, John D.	Kent State University (Ohio)	Teacher Educator D.E.
Mayleben, Donald	Rhode Island State Division of Voc.-Tech. Education	State Supr. D.E.
McCracken, E. Conway	Oxford HIgh School (Mississippi)	Coordinator, D.E.
Moore, Harold W. (Dr.)	Trenton State College (New Jersey)	Teacher Educator D.E.
Mosier, Myra Warren*	Arkansas State Dept. of Education	State Director, D.E.
Pabon, Gladys*	Puerto Rico Dept. of Education	Supervisor of D.E.
Parker, Sopholia F.	Hampton Institute	Asst. Prof. Business

*Participation cancelled due to illness.

APPENDIX A (Cont.)

Name	State/Institution	Position
Patton, Lucille W.	Oklahoma State University	Teacher Educator D.E.
Pearson, C. Edwin (Dr.)	Memphis State University	Teacher Educator D.E.
Runge, William B. (Dr.)	University of New Mexico	Teacher Educator D.E.
Rush, Ralph A. (Dr.)	Rutgers -- The State University of New Jersey	Teacher Educator D.E.
Sassman, William F.	Temple University	Assoc. Prof. Business
Scudder, Duston R.	Boise College (Idaho)	Asst. Professor
Smith, Gary R.	Utah State University	Teacher Educator D.E.
Steadman, Charles W.	University of Pittsburgh	Teacher Educator D.E.
Syhlman, William D.	Eastern Washington State College	Teacher Educator D.E.
Tiger, Dennis D.	Wisconsin State University (Whitewater)	Assoc. Professor
Tisdale, Vera P.	University of Alabama	Teacher Educator D.E.
Towry, H. N.	Northwestern State College (Louisiana)	Teacher Educator D.E.
Trapnell, Gail	Florida State Dept. of Education	Curr. Specialist D.E.
Vivian, Neal E. (Dr.)	Ohio State University	Teacher Educator D.E.
Wallace, Harold R. (Dr.)	Michigan State University	Teacher Educator D.E.
Wiggs, Garland D. (Dr.)	Rider College (New Jersey)	Teacher Educator D.E.
Woolf, William D.	Michigan State University	Instructor, D.E.
Wright, Lucille E.	State College of Iowa	Teacher Educator D.E.

APPENDIX B

SEMINAR STAFF AND ROSTER OF LECTURERS AND TASK FORCE LEADERS

Name	Position/Institution	Seminar Capacity
A. Seminar Staff		
Haines, Peter G. (Dr.)	Director, R & D Michigan State University	Director
Rowe, Kenneth L.	Teacher Educator Arizona State University	Assoc. Director
Ferguson, Edward T. (Dr.)	Teacher Educator Michigan State University	Assoc. Director
Stearns, Karl W.	Instructor Michigan State University	Adm. Assistant
Woolf, William	Graduate Assistant Michigan State University	Graduate Assistant
Pettit, Donald	Graduate Assistant Michigan State University	Graduate Assistant
Hazlett, Hatte (Mrs.)	Executive Secretary Michigan State University	Secretary
Gibson, Patricia	Secretary Arizona State University	Secretary
Buckner, Leroy (Dr.)	Teacher Educator Florida Atlantic Univ.	Senior Staff Member
Samson, Harland (Dr.)	Teacher Educator University of Wisconsin	Senior Staff Member
Meyer, Warren G.	Teacher Educator University of Minnesota	Chief Consultant
Nelson, Edwin L.	Program Specialist U.S. Office of Education	Seminar Planning Consultant
Marks, Mary V.	Program Specialist U.S. Office of Education	Seminar Planning Consultant
Nichols, Daryl	Chicago Regional Office U.S. Office of Education	Seminar Consultant

APPENDIX B (Cont.)

Name	Position/Institution	Seminar Capacity
B. Lecturers and Authors of Papers		
Antrim, William H.	Teacher-Coordinator Palo Verde High School Tucson, Arizona	Lecturer
Ashmun, Richard D. (Dr.)	Teacher Educator University of Minnesota	"
Bayles, Ernest E. (Dr.)	Professor of Education University of Kansas	"
Bernard, Louise	State Supervisor of D.E. (Emeritus) Virginia	"
Cheshire, H. R.	Teacher Educator University of Georgia	"
Coakley, Carroll B. (Dr.)	Teacher Educator University of Tennessee	"
Crawford, Lucy C. (Mrs.)	Teacher Educator Virginia Polytechnic Inst.	"
Dorr, Eugene L.	Asst. State Director of Vocational Education Arizona	"
Ely, Vivien King (Mrs.)	Teacher Educator Richmond Professional Inst.	"
Richert, G. Henry	D.E. Program Specialist (Emeritus) U.S. Office of Education	"
Rush, Ralph A. (Dr.)	Teacher Educator Rutgers -- The State University of New Jersey	"
Shulman, Lee (Dr.)	Assoc. Professor of Educational Psychology Michigan State University	"

APPENDIX C

GUIDELINES FOR TASK FORCES AND PARTICIPANTS

The National Seminar in Distributive Teacher Education offers an outstanding opportunity for professional teacher educators across the country to engage in an extended and serious inquiry into the preparation of distributive education teachers. The primary focus of the seminars will be on the project method, but, as all work in teacher education, this too must be related and integrated with the total effort in distributive teacher education.

One of the essential elements of the seminar will be a series of small group discussions and activities to be accomplished during the seminar week. Each of these small groups will be referred to as "task forces" and will work under the direction of a leader who will have the week long responsibility for the leadership of that group. The purposes of the task forces are:

1. To provide a vehicle for small group discussion of the concepts presented through speeches, demonstrations, and papers.
2. To provide each seminar participant the opportunity to "think through" problems, to see implications for him and his teacher education work, and allow him to bring his experiences to bear on problems.
3. To develop the content for documents to be produced and disseminated to the profession as a seminar output.

Task Force Groups: Each participant will serve on a task force from the "S" series and also on a task force from the "TE" series.

Developing Guidelines for Implementing the Project Plan in the School

"S" Series

S - 1 Implementing the Project Plan with Administrators, Counselors, and Local Businessmen.

S - 2 Managing and Controlling the Project "Classroom"

S - 3 Facilities, Equipment, Material and Media

S - 4 The Youth Organization as a Teaching Learning Device

S - 5 Evaluation of Project Outcomes

S - 6 Guidance, Student Selection and Identification

Gearing Up the Teacher Education Program for Project Training

"TE" Series

TE - 1 Competencies and Experiences Needed by Project Training Teachers

TE - 2 In-Service Teacher Education

TE - 3 Experiences Provided for the Teacher Trainees

TE - 4 Ancillary Services, Research and Materials Development

TE - 5 Resources Needed by the Teacher Education Institution

Operation of Task Force: There will be two series of task force groups in operation throughout most of the seminar. Thus, each participant will be involved in working with two groups. The first task force series will be on the topic "Developing Guidelines for Implementing the Project Plan in the Schools." The second series will be on the topic "Gearing Up the Teacher Education Program for Project Training." Time will be allowed at various places in the program for table discussion after presentations and for task force work periods. Extended sessions on the part of the task forces will be scheduled by the leader for evening and other times when the seminar program is not in session.

Duties of the Task Force Leader: The primary duty of the task force leader will be to direct the group's activity toward the satisfactory and beneficial completion of a guideline report on the area of inquiry assigned to that task force. The leader must schedule meetings for his group, assign necessary work to individuals, assume responsibility for careful and complete discussion on the topic, record pertinent comments and ideas on the topic with ehlp from other task force members as he desires, and direct the development by his task force of a comprehensive well written document that adequately covers the topic assigned. This document must be ready to turn in prior to the close of the seminar, and may be the basis for summary statements to be made during the course of the seminar.

Things to be Considered by Task Force Leaders: The task force leaders should be alert to the following when working with their groups.

1. Get complete and unbaised discussion on each of the presentations made and on papers or other information provided during the seminar.

2. Reinforce concepts and philosophy which the seminar is attempting to develop.

3. Assure the involvement of each and every member of the task force. Use discussion techniques to draw out those that are new and/or hesitant to enter into "intellectualizing."

4. Provide extra time with those who have strong bias on some of the concerns of the seminar. The seminar may not be correct, but each participant should give the ideas an open minded review.

5. It is expected that task force members will make liberal use of the library facilities available. Participants should be encouraged to use resource material and to provide specific illustrations whenever possible in their report.

Format of Final Report: The final report from each task force is one of the more important outcomes of the seminar. Because not all participants can be in on the specific discussions of all topics, the written report will be the only way colleagues will be able to share detailed information. The final report will become a key addition to the professional library of the distributive teacher educator. Because of the importance of the final report the format and instructions for its preparation will be provided in detail on additional sheets.

APPENDIX D

PRODUCTION SCHEDULE FOR VIDEO TAPING

May 4, 1967

To: Seminar Staff and Speakers who will video tape presentations

From: Peter G. Haines

As you know we are taping major presentations for later showing at the seminar section at Arizona State University. We will then store the tapes and determine during the summer whether they are suitable for editing and production in a professional series of kinescopes. The set would then be available for use in professional teacher education classes, conferences, and workshops.

Following are a set of suggestions as to our procedures. Also attached is a video taping schedule. It is essential that we stick to the schedule since studios and engineering crews have been assigned.

1. A release form is attached; please fill out both copies and return to me. The release guarantees you that your tape will not be shown after the MSU-ASU Seminar without your permission. If the tape is to be sold commercially, you will be contacted regarding ownership rights.
2. If possible, the men should wear blue or pastel-color shirts... yellow is okay, but not the best. We have a few "loaners" if you need them.
3. If you wear glasses, use them if you have to, or want to, but try to avoid looking up!
4. Individual speakers may stand or sit. We suggest you sit and speak from behind a desk or table, getting up once in a while to emphasize a major point or shift gears to a major topic.
5. Visuals can be used if you wish; you can check with the studio director during the orientation before taping.
6. In general, we wish to keep the presentation to about 25-28 minutes. If you have less, fine; if you have more you can shorten or run over and we can edit later.
7. Name cards will identify you to the audience; also a staff member will introduce you as would be done before a live group.
8. Everyone will be addressed as "professor" rather than "Dr.".
9. The person listed as coordinator will be sure you get to the studio and assist you in your needs.

APPENDIX D (Cont.)

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM
IN VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION

RELEASE

I, _____, of _____

_____, hereby agree to participate in the taking of pictures designed to be used in the preparation of live television shows, moving picture films, or films commonly known as kinescopes, portraying and depicting my presentation at the National Distributive Education Seminar by Michigan State University, and further consent that such pictures may be used for projection purposes and in the preparation of kinescopes, and that said materials may be shown only with may written permission except for showing at Michigan State University and Arizona State University.

_____

Date: _____

APPENDIX D (Cont.)

NATIONAL D.E. SEMINAR -- SCHEDULE FOR VIDEO TAPING AND SHOWING

TOPIC/TIME NEEDED	(INTRO) SPEAKER	(COORDINATOR) DATE/TIME OF TAPING	PLACE	ARRIVE BY	DATE/TIME SHOWN
1. Project Method in Ed. 30 minutes	Ernest Bayles (Gross)	5/8 10:15 - 11:00 (Ferguson)	Erickson	9:45 a.m.	
2. Program of D.E. Panel -- 30 minutes	Bernard, Richert, Logan, (Haines)	5/8 1:00 - 1:45 (Haines)	Erickson	12:30 p.m.	
3. Teacher Education D.E. 30 minutes	Warren Meyer (Ferguson)	5/11 11:00 - 12:00 (Ferguson)	Erickson	10:30 a.m.	
4. Types of Projects 45 minutes	Harland Samson (Meyer)	5/11 1:00 - 2:00 (Ferguson)	Erickson	12:30 p.m.	
5. Outcomes of Projects 30 minutes	Warren Meyer (Knouse)	5/11 2:00 - 3:00 (Ferguson)	Erickson	1:30 p.m.	
6. Teacher Behavior 30 minutes	Ted Ward (Samson)	(Ferguson)	Erickson		
7. Learning Theory 30 minutes	Dannenberg	(Ferguson)	Erickson		
8.					
9. Philosophy of Teacher Education	P.G. Haines (Rowe)		A.S.U.		
10. Project Training -- Impact on Prog. 30 min.	Edwin Nelson	(Rowe)	A.S.U.		
11. Similarities & Differences in Coop. & Project Training	Mary V. Marks	(Rowe)	A.S.U.		
12.					
13.					
14. Chaging Nature of Voc. Choice 30 minutes	G. Wrenn (Rowe)	(Ferguson)	224 E.H.	2" Ampex	4/10 1:00 - 1:45
15. Arizona Coordinators 20 minutes	(Rowe)	(Ferguson)	106 Kel.	1" Ampex	4/9 8:45 - 9:15
16.					
17.					
18.					

APPENDIX E

PUBLICATIONS OF THE SEMINAR

1. Readings in Distributive Education: The Project Plan of Instruction and Related Teacher Education

Table of Contents: (167 pp.)

SECTION I -- Introduction

1. An Overview
2. Project Training -- Its Impact on Program Development
3. Similarities and Differences in Project and Cooperative Training

SECTION II -- The Nature of the Project Plan of Instruction

1. Project Method in Education
2. Projects and Project Structure
3. Desired Outcomes of Projects
4. Development of a Matrix
5. Variations of Time and Place Patterns in Project Training
6. Using Appropriate Evaluation Techniques
7. Using Appropriate Materials and Media
8. The Utilization of Facilities and Equipment in D.E. Project Method Training

SECTION III -- Implementing the Project Plan Through Teacher Education

1. A Philosophy of Teacher Education: Teaching, Research, or Service?
2. Distributive Teacher Education: Its Role in Program Development
3. Gearing the Teacher Education Program for Teaching by the Project Method
4. Relations of Teacher Education to State Staff
5. Methods in Distributive Teacher Education Classrooms
6. In-Service Teacher Education
7. The Role of the Teacher Educator in Research and Materials Development
8. Teacher Behavior and Teacher Education
9. The Changing Nature of Vocational Choice

2. Guidelines for Implementing the Project Plan of Instruction in Distributive Education Through Teacher Education

Table of Contents: (94 pp.)

T - 1 Competencies and Experiences Needed by Project Training Teachers

T - 2 In-Service Teacher Education

T - 3 Experiences Provided for the Teacher Trainees

T - 4 Ancillary Services, Research and Materials Development

T - 5 Resources Needed by the Teacher Education Institution

3. Guidelines for Implementing the Project Plan of Instruction in Distributive Education in the Schools

Table of Contents: (91 pp.)

S - 1 Implementing Project Training with Administrators, Counselors and Local Businessmen

S - 2 Managing and Controlling Laboratory Experiences

S - 3 Facilities, Equipment, Material and Media

S - 4 The Youth Organization as a Teaching-Learning Device

S - 5 Guidelines for Implementing Project Training in the School

S - 6 Guidance, Student Selection and Identification

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM In Vocational-Technical Education

APPENDIX F

APPLICATION FOR NATIONAL SEMINAR IN DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION

Date _____

I. Personal Information

1. Full Name: Dr. ___ Mr. ___ Mrs. ___ Miss ___

_____
Last Name First Name Middle

2. Home Address: _____
Number Street City State Phone

3. Institution: _____
Name Address Phone

Name of immediate supervisor (Dean, Director, etc.) _____

II. Education

1. List in chronological order all college and university degrees earned, beginning bachelors; show number of hours earned beyond last degree.

School	Degree	Year Earned
College or University:		

2. Thesis subject: M. A. _____
Doctoral _____

III. Experience

1. Prior Teacher Education Experience:

Institutions			Title of position, subjects taught	
Name	Location	Type	and other duties performed	Dates

2. Present Employment:

Rank and Title: _____
Number of Years in Present Position: _____
Duties and Responsibilities: (includes titles of courses normally taught) _____

Approximate Time During 12 Month Year Devoted to Teaching, Research, & Service in the Professional Distributive Teacher Education Program: _____%

IV. Evidences of Scholarship

1. Publications in Last 5 Years: (Attach additional sheet if necessary)

Title	Date	Publisher or Journal
Books:		
Articles & Reviews:		

2. Research Achievements not Covered in "Publications:"

V. Additional Information

In general, participants will be assigned to geographic seminar locations, so as to maximize the use of financial resources. However, please circle which of the two sections you wish to attend and give reasons on an appended sheet if one is a must.

Michigan State University	Arizona State University
May 7-12, 1967	May 21-26, 1967

(If you must attend a section that results in substantially increased travel costs, you may attend that section provided space is available and your institution is willing to provide travel costs in excell of those to the nearest seminar section.)

Date _____ Signed _____

Return by Special Delivery no later than _____ to:

Director
Research & Development Program
115 Erickson
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48823

(If you feel that additional information is necessary to clarify your teacher education responsibilities, present or future, please append an extra sheet.)